

1 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
 BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342  
 2 JACOB R. SORENSEN #209134  
 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855  
 3 DANIEL J. RICHERT #232208  
 50 Fremont Street  
 4 Post Office Box 7880  
 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880  
 5 Telephone: (415) 983-1000  
 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200  
 6 Email: bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com

7 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
 DAVID W. CARPENTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 8 BRADFORD A. BERENSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 DAVID L. LAWSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 9 EDWARD R. MCNICHOLAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 ERIC A. SHUMSKY #206164  
 10 1501 K Street, N.W.  
 Washington, D.C. 20005  
 11 Telephone: (202) 736-8010  
 Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

12 Attorneys for Defendant AT&T CORP.  
 13

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17  
 18 In re:  
 19 NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY  
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS  
 20 LITIGATION

21  
 22 This Document Relates To:  
 23 *TASH HEPTING, et al. v. AT&T CORP.*,  
 24 No. C-06-0672-VRW

MDL Dkt. No. 06-1791-VRW

**RESPONSE OF AT&T CORP. TO  
 HEPTING PLAINTIFFS'  
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
 RELATE JEWEL TO HEPTING  
 [Docket Nos. 383-84]**

[Civ. L.R. 3-12(e)]

Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor  
 Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker

1 This is the response of **AT&T CORP.** (“AT&T”) to the “Administrative Motion by  
2 Plaintiffs to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related; Declaration of Kevin Bankston,”  
3 MDL Docket No. 383, filed Oct. 21, 2008.

4 *Jewel* is a case brought solely against the federal government and various  
5 government officials. *Hepting* is a case brought solely against AT&T and its parent  
6 (although the federal government intervened to assert the state secrets defense).

7 *Jewel* asserts 17 claims, at least nine of which do not appear in *Hepting*. *Hepting*  
8 asserts seven claims, only three of which appear in *Jewel*. (The numbers do not add up  
9 because some legal theories asserted as one count in *Hepting* appear in as many as four  
10 counts in *Jewel*.) Despite some “subject matter” overlap, the two cases raise different legal  
11 issues and may be met by very different defenses.

12 AT&T does not object to relating *Jewel* to *Hepting* so long as relating the two cases  
13 does not affect in any way the Court’s briefing schedule (MDL Docket No. 381) for  
14 dispositive motions pursuant to the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-261.  
15 The principal purpose of Title II of the FISA Amendments Act is to achieve a prompt  
16 dismissal of cases such as *Hepting* filed against carriers. It would frustrate congressional  
17 intent to let a procedural device such as a related-case motion delay the Court’s  
18 consideration of dispositive motions filed pursuant to the FISA Amendments Act.

19 Dated: October 23, 2008.

20 PILLSBURY WINTHROP  
21 SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
22 BRUCE A. ERICSON  
23 JACOB R. SORENSEN  
24 MARC H. AXELBAUM  
DANIEL J. RICHERT  
50 Fremont Street  
Post Office Box 7880  
San Francisco, CA 94120-7880

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
DAVID W. CARPENTER\*  
BRADFORD A. BERENSON\*  
DAVID L. LAWSON\*  
EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS\*  
ERIC A. SHUMSKY  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

\* admitted *pro hac vice*

25  
26 By /s/ Bruce A. Ericson  
Bruce A. Ericson

By /s/ Bradford A. Berenson  
Bradford A. Berenson

27 Attorneys for Defendant AT&T Corp.  
28